arXiv:1304.0721v1 [math.DG] 2 Apr 2013

EXTENSIONS AND FILL-INS WITH NONNEGATIVE SCALAR CURVATURE

JEFFREY L. JAUREGUI, PENGZI MIAO, AND LUEN-FAI TAM[1]

Abstract. Motivated by the quasi-local mass problem in general relativity, we apply the asymptotically flat extensions, constructed by Shi and Tam in the proof of the positivity of the Brown–York mass, to study a fill-in problem of realizing geometric data on a 2-sphere as the boundary of a compact 3-manifold of nonnegative scalar curvature. We characterize the relationship between two borderline cases: one in which the Shi–Tam extension has zero total mass, and another in which fill-ins of nonnegative scalar curvature fail to exist. Additionally, we prove a type of positive mass theorem in the latter case.

1. Introduction

The boundary geometry of compact Riemannian 3-manifolds of nonnegative scalar curvature plays an important role in the quasi-local mass problem in general relativity.

Given a spacetime N satisfying the dominant energy condition, and a bounded, space-like, time-symmetric (i.e., totally geodesic) hypersurface Ω in N, the Riemannian manifold Ω necessarily has nonnegative scalar curvature. The quasi-local mass of Ω in N is expected to depend only on the geometry of the boundary 2-surface $\Sigma = \partial\Omega$: in particular, the induced metric γ on Σ and the mean curvature H of Σ in Ω, in the outward direction. When apparent horizons of black holes are present in Ω, one assumes $\partial\Omega \setminus \Sigma$ is not empty and consists of minimal surfaces.

In [2, 3], Bartnik conjectured that, given Ω, Σ, γ and H in the above setting, there exists an asymptotically flat, static vacuum extension of Ω with the prescribed boundary metric γ and boundary mean curvature H. Motivated by that conjecture, the following definition was given in [10] (all metrics and functions below are assumed to be smooth, unless otherwise stated):

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 53C20; Secondary 83C99 .

[1] Research partially supported by Hong Kong RGC General Research Fund #CUHK 403011.

Definition 1. A triple (Σ, γ, H), where Σ is a surface that is topologically a 2-sphere, γ is a metric on Σ of positive Gaussian curvature, and H is a positive function on Σ, is called *Bartnik data*.

For Bartnik data (Σ, γ, H) to be physically meaningful, one wants to know whether it indeed arises as the boundary data of some compact 3-manifold of nonnegative scalar curvature. We recall the following definition from [10]:

Definition 2. A *nonnegative scalar curvature fill-in* of Bartnik data (Σ, γ, H) is a compact Riemannian 3-manifold with boundary (Ω, g) of nonnegative scalar curvature such that:

- (Σ, γ) is isometric to a connected component of $\partial\Omega$ and, under this isometry, H equals the mean curvature of Σ in (Ω, g), and
- $\partial\Omega \setminus \Sigma$ is either empty or else is a (possibly disconnected) minimal surface.

A necessary condition for (Σ, γ, H) to admit a nonnegative scalar curvature fill-in is provided by [14, Theorem 1] (also known as the positivity of Brown–York mass [6, 7]).

Theorem 1 (Shi–Tam [14])**.** *Let Ω be a compact Riemannian 3-manifold with nonnegative scalar curvature with boundary Σ. Suppose the induced metric γ on Σ has positive Gaussian curvature and the mean curvature H of Σ in Ω is positive, then*

$$\int_\Sigma H dv_\gamma \leq \int_\Sigma H_0 dv_\gamma \tag{1.1}$$

where H_0 is the mean curvature of the embedding of (Σ, γ) in $\mathbb{R}^3$ and dv_γ is the area form on (Σ, γ). Moreover, equality in (1.1) holds if and only if Ω is isometric to a domain in $\mathbb{R}^3$.

Remark 1. Though Theorem 1 is stated for a manifold Ω with $\partial\Omega = \Sigma$, its conclusion still holds for those Ω with $\partial\Omega \setminus \Sigma$ consisting of minimal surfaces. In that case one replaces the use of the positive mass theorem [13, 15] in the proof in [14] by the Riemannian Penrose inequality [5, 9]. Details of such an argument can be found in [12, section 3.2].

In [10], a unique constant λ_0 is defined in association with any Bartnik data (Σ, γ, H):

$$\lambda_0 = \sup \Lambda \tag{1.2}$$

where

$\Lambda = \{\lambda > 0 \mid (\Sigma, \gamma, \lambda H) \text{ admits a nonnegative scalar curvature fill-in}\}.$

It follows immediately from Theorem 1 and Remark 1 that

$$\lambda_0 \leq \frac{\int_\Sigma H_0 dv_\gamma}{\int_\Sigma H dv_\gamma}. \tag{1.3}$$

On the other hand, it was proved in [10, Theorem 10] that $\lambda_0 > 0$ and

$$\Lambda = (0, \lambda_0) \text{ or } (0, \lambda_0], \tag{1.4}$$

and conjectured that $\lambda_0 \in \Lambda$ ([10, Problem 2]).

In this paper, we first give a more refined estimate of λ_0 than (1.3) (see Theorem 8 in Section 3). As a corollary, we characterize Bartnik data (Σ, γ, H) whose λ_0 gives the equality in (1.3).

Theorem 2. *Given Bartnik boundary data (Σ, γ, H), the constant λ_0 satisfies*

$$\lambda_0 = \frac{\int_\Sigma H_0 dv_\gamma}{\int_\Sigma H dv_\gamma} \tag{1.5}$$

if and only if H is a constant multiple of H_0. Here, H_0 is the mean curvature of the isometric embedding of (Σ, γ) in $\mathbb{R}^3$.

It follows immediately from Theorem 2 and (1.3) that condition (1.1) is not sufficient for (Σ, γ, H) to possess a nonnegative scalar curvature fill-in: given Bartnik data (Σ, γ, H) whose H is not a constant multiple of H_0, if we consider the related triple $(\Sigma, \gamma, \lambda H)$, where $\lambda \in \left(\lambda_0, \frac{\int_\Sigma H_0}{\int_\Sigma H}\right]$, then $(\Sigma, \gamma, \lambda H)$ satisfies (1.1) but does not admit any nonnegative scalar curvature fill-in.

A statement stronger than Theorem 2, which also follows from Theorem 8, is:

Theorem 3. *Given Bartnik data (Σ, γ, H) satisfying*

$$\int_\Sigma (H_0 - H) dv_\gamma = 0 \text{ but } H \neq H_0, \tag{1.6}$$

there exists a constant $\epsilon > 0$, depending on (Σ, γ, H), such that for any function $\tilde{H}$ on Σ satisfying

$$\tilde{H} > H - \epsilon, \tag{1.7}$$

$(\Sigma, \gamma, \tilde{H})$ admits no fill-ins of nonnegative scalar curvature.

Our proof of Theorem 8 (stated in Section 3) follows the idea and arguments in [14]. Basically, we use extensions of (Σ, γ, H) to study its fill-ins.

Definition 3. A complete non-compact Riemannian manifold (N, g) with nonempty boundary is called an *extension* of (Σ, γ, H) if $\partial N = \Sigma$, the induced metric from g on Σ is γ and the mean curvature of Σ in (N, g), in the direction pointing into N, is H.

Given Bartnik data (Σ, γ, H), a natural choice of asymptotically flat extension (N, g), having zero scalar curvature, of (Σ, γ, H) was constructed in [14]. In section 2, we consider the map

$$\Phi(H) = \mathfrak{m}(g)$$

where $\mathfrak{m}(g)$ is the total (ADM) mass (see [1]) of such an (N, g) (with Σ and γ fixed) and show that $\Phi(\cdot)$ is continuous in the C^0-topology and is strictly monotone decreasing along each path $\{\lambda H\}_{\lambda > 0}$. In section 3, we apply results on $\Phi(\cdot)$ to the fill-in problem and prove Theorem 8.

In the remaining part of the paper, section 4, we prove a positive mass theorem for asymptotically flat nonnegative scalar curvature extensions of $(\Sigma, \gamma, \lambda_0 H)$, and show that the zero mass case occurs only if the extension is static vacuum (see Definition 4). Such a result is in relation to the conjecture ([10, Problem 2]) that $(\Sigma, \gamma, \lambda_0 H)$ admits a nonnegative scalar curvature fill-in.

Theorem 4. *Given Bartnik data (Σ, γ, H), let (M, g) be an asymptotically flat extension of $(\Sigma, \gamma, \lambda_0 H)$ with nonnegative scalar curvature. Then either (M, g) has positive mass or else (M, g) is static vacuum with zero mass.*

2. Analysis of the mass functional

In this section, Σ_0 is assumed to be a compact, connected, strictly convex hypersurface in $\mathbb{R}^n$ with $n \geq 3$. Let Ω_0 be the domain bounded by Σ_0 and let $\Sigma_r = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega_0 \mid d(x, \Sigma_0) = r\}$ where $d(\cdot, \Sigma_0)$ is the Euclidean distance to Σ_0. Then Σ_r, $r \geq 0$, are strictly convex, and $N = \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega_0$ is foliated by $\{\Sigma_r\}$. We shall henceforth identify N with $\Sigma_0 \times [0, \infty)$, with the Euclidean metric $g_{_E}$ given by $dr^2 + g_r$, where g_r is the induced metric on Σ_r.

Consider the parabolic initial value problem:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{rcl} H_0 \dfrac{\partial u}{\partial r} & = & u^2 \Delta_r u + \frac{1}{2}(u - u^3) R_r, \text{ on } \Sigma_0 \times [0, \infty), \\ u(x, 0) & = & u_0(x), \end{array} \right. \tag{2.1}$$

where H_0 is the mean curvature of Σ_r, R_r is the scalar curvature of Σ_r, and u_0 is a positive function on Σ_0. The geometric meaning of (2.1) is that the metric $g_u = u^2 dr^2 + g_r$ has zero scalar curvature and (N, g_u) is an extension of $(\Sigma_0, g_0, H_0/u_0)$.

Given any $u_0 > 0$ on Σ_0, by [14, Theorem 2.1] there exists a unique positive solution u to (2.1). Define

$$\mathfrak{m}(u_0; r) = \int_{\Sigma_r} H_0(1 - u^{-1}) d\sigma_r \tag{2.2}$$

and

$$\mathfrak{m}(u_0) = \lim_{r\to\infty} \mathfrak{m}(u_0; r), \tag{2.3}$$

where $d\sigma_r$ is the Euclidean area form induced on Σ_r. The following facts on $\mathfrak{m}(u_0; r)$ and $\mathfrak{m}(u_0)$ were proved in Lemma 4.2 and Theorem 2.1 (c) in [14]:

a) $\mathfrak{m}(u_0; r)$ is monotone decreasing in r with

$$\frac{d}{dr}\mathfrak{m}(u_0; r) = -\frac{1}{2}\int_{\Sigma_r} R_r u^{-1}(1-u)^2 d\sigma_r. \tag{2.4}$$

b) The metric $g_u = u^2 dr^2 + g_r$ is asymptotically flat, with total mass equal to $\mathfrak{m}(u_0)$, up to multiplication by a positive constant depending only on n.

In what follows, we apply the monotonicity of $\mathfrak{m}(\cdot, r)$ to obtain some additional properties on $\mathfrak{m}(\cdot)$. We first give a comparison principle for solutions to (2.1):

Lemma 1.

(i) *Given two positive functions u_0 and v_0 on Σ_0, let u, v be the solutions to* (2.1) *on $\Sigma_0 \times [0, \infty)$ with initial conditions u_0, v_0 respectively. If $u_0 \geq v_0$, then $u \geq v$ on $\Sigma_0 \times [0, \infty)$. If in addition $u_0 \neq v_0$, then $u > v$ on $\Sigma_0 \times (0, \infty)$.*

(ii) *Let $\{u_0^{(i)}\}$ and v_0 be positive functions on Σ_0, and let $\{u^{(i)}\}$, v be the solutions to* (2.1) *on $\Sigma_0 \times [0, \infty)$ with initial conditions $\{u_0^{(i)}\}$, v_0 respectively. Suppose $\lim_{i\to\infty} \sup_{\Sigma_0} |u_0^{(i)} - v_0| = 0$. Then for all $T > 0$,*

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} \sup_{\Sigma_0\times[0,T]} |u^{(i)} - v| = 0.$$

Proof. (i) Let $f = u - v$. By (2.1) and subtracting, one has

$$H_0 \frac{\partial f}{\partial r} = u^2 \Delta_r f + wf, \tag{2.5}$$

where

$$w = [(u + v)\Delta_r v] - \frac{1}{2}[(u^2 + uv + v^2) - 1]R^r.$$

For each fixed $T > 0$, let C be a constant satisfying

$$C \geq \frac{||w||_{L^\infty(\Sigma_0 \times [0,T])}}{\min_{\Sigma_0 \times [0,T]} H_0}. \tag{2.6}$$

Clearly C can be chosen to depend only on

$$\sup_{\Sigma_0 \times [0,T]} \left(|\Delta_r v| + |u| + |v| + R^r + H_0^{-1} \right).$$

Let β be a constant satisfying $\beta > C$. On $\Sigma_0 \times [0,T]$, (2.5) implies

$$H_0 \frac{\partial}{\partial r}(e^{-\beta r} f) = u^2 \Delta_r (e^{-\beta r} f) - (\beta H_0 - w) e^{-\beta r} f, \tag{2.7}$$

and $\beta H_0 - w > 0$ on $\Sigma_0 \times [0,T]$ by (2.6). It follows from (2.7) and the maximum principle that $e^{-\beta r} f \geq 0$ on $\Sigma_0 \times [0,T]$. As T is arbitrary, $f \geq 0$ on $\Sigma_0 \times [0,\infty)$. If $f \not\equiv 0$ on Σ_0, then $f > 0$ on $\Sigma_0 \times (0,\infty)$ by the strong maximum principle.

(ii) The proof is similar. Since $\{u_0^{(i)}\}$ converges to v_0 on Σ_0 in the C^0-norm, by [14, Lemma 2.2] there is a constant C_1 independent of i such that $|u^{(i)}| \leq C_1$ on $\Sigma_0 \times [0,\infty)$ for all i. Let $f^{(i)} = u^{(i)} - v$. For each fixed $T > 0$, as in (i) one can find a constant $\beta > 0$ which is independent of i such that

$$H_0 \frac{\partial}{\partial r}(e^{-\beta r} f^{(i)}) = (u^{(i)})^2 \Delta_r (e^{-\beta r} f^{(i)}) - (\beta H_0 - w^{(i)}) e^{-\beta r} f^{(i)}, \tag{2.8}$$

and $\beta H_0 - w^{(i)} > 0$ on $\Sigma_0 \times [0,T]$, where

$$w^{(i)} = [(u^{(i)} + v)\Delta_r v] - \frac{1}{2}[(u^{(i)})^2 + u^{(i)} v + v^2 - 1] R^r.$$

One then concludes by the maximum principle that

$$\max_{\Sigma_0 \times [0,T]} \left| e^{-\beta r} f^{(i)} \right| = \max_{\Sigma_0} |f^{(i)}|.$$

From this the result follows. ☐

Theorem 5. *Suppose $u_0 \geq v_0$ on Σ_0. Then*

(i) *$\mathfrak{m}(u_0; r) \geq \mathfrak{m}(v_0; r)$ for all $r \geq 0$. If $\mathfrak{m}(u_0; r) = \mathfrak{m}(v_0; r)$ for some r, then $u_0 = v_0$.*

(ii) *$\mathfrak{m}(u_0) \geq \mathfrak{m}(v_0)$. If $\mathfrak{m}(u_0) = \mathfrak{m}(v_0)$, then $u_0 = v_0$.*

Proof. (i) follows directly from Lemma 1. The claim $\mathfrak{m}(u_0) \geq \mathfrak{m}(v_0)$ in (ii) follows from (i). We now focus on the equality case in (ii).

Let u, v be the unique positive solutions to (2.1) with initial conditions u_0, v_0 respectively. By Theorem 2.1 in [14], u and v have an asymptotic expansion

$$u = 1 + c(n)\mathfrak{m}(u_0) r^{2-n} + O(r^{1-n}) \tag{2.9}$$

and

$$v = 1 + c(n)\mathfrak{m}(v_0)r^{2-n} + O(r^{1-n}) \tag{2.10}$$

as $r \to \infty$, where $c(n)$ is some positive constant depending only on n. By Lemma 2.1 in [14], the mean curvature H_0 of Σ_r in $\mathbb{R}^n$ satisfies

$$H_0 = \frac{n-1}{r} + O(r^{-2}). \tag{2.11}$$

Therefore, it follows from (2.9) – (2.11) that there exist constants $R_1 > 0$ and $C_1 > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{m}(u_0; r) - \mathfrak{m}(v_0; r) &= \int_{\Sigma_r} H_0 \left(\frac{u-v}{uv} \right) d\sigma_r \\ &\geq \frac{C_1}{r} \int_{\Sigma_r} (u-v) d\sigma_r, \end{aligned} \tag{2.12}$$

for all $r \geq R_1$. (Here we also used the fact $u \geq v$ by Lemma 1.)

Now suppose $\mathfrak{m}(u_0) = \mathfrak{m}(v_0)$. By [14, Lemma 4.2], i.e. (2.4), we have

$$\mathfrak{m}(u_0; r) - \mathfrak{m}(v_0; r) = \frac{1}{2} \int_r^\infty \left[\int_{\Sigma_s} R_s \left(1 - \frac{1}{uv} \right) (u-v) d\sigma_s \right] ds \tag{2.13}$$

for any r. By Lemma 2.1 in [14], the scalar curvature R_r of Σ_r satisfies

$$R_r = \frac{(n-1)(n-2)}{r^2} + O(r^{-3}). \tag{2.14}$$

Therefore, there exist constants $R_2 > 0$ and $C_2 > 0$ such that

$$\mathfrak{m}(u_0; r) - \mathfrak{m}(v_0; r) \leq C_2 \int_r^\infty \left[s^{-n} \int_{\Sigma_s} (u-v) d\sigma_s \right] ds \tag{2.15}$$

for all $r \geq R_2$. It follows from (2.12) and (2.15) that

$$\mathfrak{m}(u_0; r) - \mathfrak{m}(v_0; r) \leq C_3 \int_r^\infty s^{1-n} [\mathfrak{m}(u_0; s) - \mathfrak{m}(v_0; s)] ds \tag{2.16}$$

for $r \geq R_3 = \max\{R_1, R_2\}$ with a constant $C_3 > 0$ independent of r. Let

$$F(r) = \int_r^\infty s^{1-n} [\mathfrak{m}(u_0; s) - \mathfrak{m}(v_0; s)] ds,$$

which is finite by (2.15). Then

$$r^{n-1} \frac{d}{dr} F(r) + C_3 F(r) \geq 0,$$

which shows $F(r) \exp\left(\frac{C_3}{(2-n) r^{n-2}} \right)$ is monotone increasing on (R_3, ∞). On the other hand, we have $F(r) \geq 0$ and $\lim_{r \to \infty} F(r) = 0$. Therefore,

$$F(r) = 0, \text{ for all } r \geq R_3.$$

Hence, $\mathfrak{m}(u_0; r) = \mathfrak{m}(v_0; r)$ for large r. We conclude $u_0 = v_0$ by (i). $\square$

Next we show that $\mathfrak{m}(\cdot)$ is continuous on $C^\infty_+(\Sigma_0)$, the space of smooth, positive functions on Σ_0, endowed with the C^0-topology.

Theorem 6. *The functional*

$$\mathfrak{m}(\cdot) : C^\infty_+(\Sigma_0) \to \mathbb{R}$$

is continuous with respect to the C^0-norm.

Proof. Let $v_0 \in C^\infty_+(\Sigma_0)$. Let $\delta_0 > 0$ and $a > 0$ be two constants such that if $u_0 \in C^\infty_+(\Sigma_0)$ with $||u_0 - v_0||_{C^0(\Sigma_0)} < \delta_0$, then $a^{-1} \le u_0 \le a$. Given any $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$, let $u_0 \in C^\infty_+(\Sigma_0)$ with $||u_0 - v_0||_{C^0(\Sigma_0)} < \delta$. Let u and v be the positive solutions to (2.1) with initial data u_0 and v_0 respectively. By [14, Lemma 2.2], there is a constant C_1, depending only on Σ_0 and a (hence independent of u_0) such that

$$|u - 1| \le C_1 r^{2-n} \ \text{ and } \ |v - 1| \le C_1 r^{2-n}. \tag{2.17}$$

By [14, Lemma 2.1], the scalar curvature R_r of g_r satisfies

$$0 < R_r \le C_2 r^{-2} \tag{2.18}$$

for some constant C_2 depending only on Σ_0. By [14, Lemma 2.4], $(\Sigma_0, r^{-2} g_r)$ converges to the standard unit sphere $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. Therefore, by [14, Lemma 4.2], i.e. (2.4), we have for any $r_0 \ge 0$

$$\begin{aligned} & |[\mathfrak{m}(u_0) - \mathfrak{m}(v_0)] - [\mathfrak{m}(u_0; r_0) - \mathfrak{m}(v_0; r_0)]| \\ = & \frac{1}{2} \left| \int_{r_0}^\infty \left[\int_{\Sigma_s} R_s \left(1 - \frac{1}{uv} \right) (v - u) d\sigma_s \right] ds \right| \\ \le & C_3 r_0^{2-n} \end{aligned} \tag{2.19}$$

for some constant C_3 independent of u_0 and r_0.

Given any $\epsilon > 0$, choose r_0 large enough so that $C_3 r_0^{2-n} < \frac{1}{2}\epsilon$. For this fixed r_0, Lemma 1(ii) implies that the functional $u_0 \mapsto \mathfrak{m}(u_0; r_0)$ is continuous with respect to the C^0-norm. Hence if $\delta > 0$ is small enough, then

$$|\mathfrak{m}(u_0; r_0) - \mathfrak{m}(v_0; r_0)| < \frac{1}{2}\epsilon.$$

Combining this with (2.19), the theorem follows. $\square$

By Theorem 5 and Theorem 6, we have the following:

Theorem 7. *Given any $u_0 \in C^\infty_+(\Sigma_0)$, the function $t \mapsto \mathfrak{m}(tu_0)$ is a continuous, strictly increasing function on $(0, \infty)$, satisfying*

$$\lim_{t \to 0+} \mathfrak{m}(tu_0) < 0 \text{ and } \lim_{t \to \infty} \mathfrak{m}(tu_0) > 0. \tag{2.20}$$

Moreover, if t_0 *is the unique number in* $(0,\infty)$ *such that* $\mathfrak{m}(t_0u_0)=0$, *then*

$$t_0 \geq \frac{\int_{\Sigma_0} H_0 u_0^{-1}\, d\sigma_0}{\int_{\Sigma_0} H_0\, d\sigma_0}, \tag{2.21}$$

and equality holds if and only if u_0 *is a constant.*

Proof. The continuity and strict monotonicity of $\mathfrak{m}(tu_0)$ follow from Theorem 6 and Theorem 5, respectively. Claims (2.20) follow from Theorem 5 and the fact $\mathfrak{m}(v_0)=0$ if $v_0\equiv 1$. Let t_0 be such that $\mathfrak{m}(t_0u_0)=0$. By (2.4), we have $\mathfrak{m}(t_0u_0;0)\geq 0$ and $\mathfrak{m}(t_0u_0;0)=0$ if and only if $t_0u_0=1$. Since $\mathfrak{m}(t_0u_0;0)=\int_{\Sigma_0} H_0\left[1-(t_0u_0)^{-1}\right]d\sigma_0$, the second part of the theorem follows. ☐

3. Applications to fill-ins

Given Bartnik data (Σ,γ,H), we isometrically embed (Σ,γ) as a closed, strictly convex surface Σ_0 in $\mathbb{R}^3$ with mean curvature H_0, and we identify its exterior region with $N=\Sigma\times[0,\infty)$. Let $\mathfrak{m}(\cdot;r)$ and $\mathfrak{m}(\cdot)$ be the functionals defined in (2.2) and (2.3). Apply Theorem 7 to the function $u_0=H_0/H$, so that the corresponding metric $u^2dr^2+g_r$ is an extension of (Σ,γ,H). In particular, there is a unique $\mu_0>0$ such that

$$\begin{cases} \mathfrak{m}(H_0/(\mu_0H)) & = & 0, \\ \mathfrak{m}(H_0/(\mu H)) & > & 0, \text{ if } \mu<\mu_0, \\ \mathfrak{m}(H_0/(\mu H)) & < & 0, \text{ if } \mu>\mu_0. \end{cases} \tag{3.1}$$

Theorem 8. *Given Bartnik data* (Σ,γ,H), *the following are true:*

- (i) $\lambda_0\leq\mu_0\leq\dfrac{\int_\Sigma H_0dv_\gamma}{\int_\Sigma Hdv_\gamma}$.
- (ii) $\mu_0=\frac{\int_\Sigma H_0dv_\gamma}{\int_\Sigma Hdv_\gamma}$ *if and only if* $H=\mu_0^{-1}H_0$.
- (iii) *For any function* $\hat{H}\geq\mu_0H$, $(\Sigma,\gamma,\hat{H})$ *does not have a fill-in of nonnegative scalar curvature, unless* $\hat{H}=\mu_0H=H_0$.
- (iv) *If* $\lambda_0=\mu_0$, *then* $(\Sigma,\gamma,\lambda_0H)$ *does not admit a nonnegative scalar curvature fill-in, unless* $\mu_0H=H_0$.

Proof. (i) For $\lambda>0$, if $(\Sigma,\gamma,\lambda H)$ has a nonnegative scalar curvature fill-in, then $\mathfrak{m}(H_0/(\lambda H))\geq 0$ by the version of the positive mass theorem in [14, Theorem 3.1] (also see [11, Theorem 1] and Remark 1). Therefore, $\lambda\leq\mu_0$. This implies the first inequality, by the definition of λ_0. The second inequality follows from (2.21).

(ii) is just a restatement of the rigidity case in (2.21).

(iii) Given $\hat{H} \geq \mu_0 H$, suppose $(\Sigma, \gamma, \hat{H})$ has a nonnegative scalar curvature fill-in (Ω, g). Using the fact $\mathfrak{m}(H_0/(\mu_0 H)) = 0$ and applying the rigidity part of [14, Theorem 3.1] (also see [11, Theorem 2] and Remark 1), we conclude $\hat{H} = \mu_0 H$ and (Ω, g) is isometric to a domain in $\mathbb{R}^3$ with boundary mean curvature H_0. Therefore, $\hat{H} = \mu_0 H = H_0$.

(iv) Suppose $\lambda_0 = \mu_0$ and $(\Sigma, \gamma, \lambda_0 H)$ has a nonnegative scalar curvature fill-in, then the proof of (iii) shows $\mu_0 H = H_0$. □

Remark 2. In [10] and [12] the following quasi-local mass functionals were proposed:

$$m_0(\Sigma, \gamma, H) = \sqrt{\frac{|\Sigma|_\gamma}{16\pi}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\lambda_0^2}\right),$$

$$m_1(\Sigma, \gamma, H) = \sqrt{\frac{|\Sigma|_\gamma}{16\pi}} \left[1 - \left(\frac{\int_\Sigma H dv_\gamma}{\int_\Sigma H_0 dv_\gamma}\right)^2\right],$$

where $|\Sigma|_\gamma$ is the area of (Σ, γ). In terms of μ_0, a related functional is:

$$m_2(\Sigma, \gamma, H) = \sqrt{\frac{|\Sigma|_\gamma}{16\pi}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\mu_0^2}\right), \tag{3.2}$$

and Theorem 8 shows $m_0 \leq m_2 \leq m_1$.

If $kH = H_0$ for some positive constant k, then (Σ, γ, kH) has a Euclidean fill-in (Ω_0, g_E), hence $\lambda_0 = \mu_0 = k$. When H is not a constant multiple of H_0, Theorem 8 directly implies the following corollary, whose (i) and (ii) are Theorem 2 and 3 in the introduction.

Corollary 1. *Given Bartnik data* (Σ, γ, H) *satisfying*

$$\int_\Sigma (H_0 - H) dv_\gamma = 0 \text{ but } H \neq H_0, \tag{3.3}$$

then

(ii) $\lambda_0 \leq \mu_0 < 1$.

(ii) *There exists* $\epsilon > 0$, *depending on* (Σ, γ, H), *such that if* $\hat{H} > H - \epsilon$, *then* $(\Sigma, \gamma, \hat{H})$ *admits no fill-ins of nonnegative scalar curvature.*

(iii) *If* $\lambda_0 = \mu_0$, *then* $(\Sigma, \gamma, \lambda_0 H)$ *does not admit any nonnegative scalar curvature fill-in.*

We record a lower bound of μ_0.

Proposition 1. *Given Bartnik data* (Σ, γ, H),

$$\mu_0^2 \geq \left(\int_\Sigma H_0 dv_\gamma\right) \left(\int_\Sigma \frac{H^2}{H_0} dv_\gamma\right)^{-1}. \tag{3.4}$$

Proof. By [14, Lemma 2.11] (also see [4]), if u is the solution of (2.1) with initial condition u_0, then

$$\int_{\Sigma_r} H_0(1-u^{-2})d\sigma_r$$

is monotone nondecreasing in r and limiting to a positive constant multiple of $\mathfrak{m}(u_0)$. Take $u_0 = H_0/(\mu_0 H)$, we have

$$\int_{\Sigma} H_0(1-(\mu_0 H)^2 H_0^{-2})d\sigma \leq 0,$$

by the definition of μ_0. This implies (3.4). □

4. λ_0 AND STATIC VACUUM METRICS

Given Bartnik data (Σ, γ, H), it was conjectured that $(\Sigma, \gamma, \lambda_0 H)$ admits a nonnegative scalar curvature fill-in (cf. [10, Problem 2]). In [10, Proposition 5], it was proved that such a fill-in must be static vacuum. By results in [11, 14] and Remark 1, a necessary condition for this conjecture to hold is that any asymptotically flat nonnegative scalar curvature extension of $(\Sigma, \gamma, \lambda_0 H)$ must have nonnegative mass. In the rest of this paper we prove that this necessary condition holds.

Definition 4 ([8])**.** A Riemannian metric g is called *static* on an open set Ω if the formal L^2-adjoint of the linearization of the scalar curvature map at g has non-trivial kernel, i.e. there exists a function f, not identically zero, satisfying

$$-(\Delta_g f)g + \nabla_g^2 f - f\mathrm{Ric}(g) = 0 \tag{4.1}$$

on Ω. Here, $\Delta_g f$ and $\nabla_g^2 f$ are the Laplacian and Hessian of f, and $\mathrm{Ric}(g)$ is the Ricci curvature of g. g is called *static vacuum* if, in addition, g has zero scalar curvature.

Theorem 9. *Given Bartnik data (Σ, γ, H), let (M, g) be an asymptotically flat extension, having nonnegative scalar curvature, of $(\Sigma, \gamma, \lambda_0 H)$. Then the total mass of (M, g) is nonnegative, and is zero only if g is static vacuum on the interior of M.*

Proof. If the statement fails, then $\mathfrak{m}(g) = 0$ and g is not static vacuum on $\overset{\circ}{M}$ (the interior of M), or else $\mathfrak{m}(g) < 0$. We address these two cases separately. $\mathfrak{m}(\cdot)$ will denote the total mass.

First, suppose $\mathfrak{m}(g) = 0$ and g is not static vacuum on $\overset{\circ}{M}$. Then g is not static on $\overset{\circ}{M}$, since static metrics have constant scalar curvature ([8, Proposition 2.3]) and g is asymptotically flat. Then there exists a domain $U \subset\subset \overset{\circ}{M}$ such that g is not static on U (see the proof of

Proposition 3.2 in [8]). Applying Theorem 4 in [8], one can push the scalar curvature up slightly on U while keeping the metric g unchanged outside $\overline{U}$. In other words, there exists another metric $\tilde{g}$ on M such that $\tilde{g}$ agrees with g outside $\overline{U}$, the scalar curvature of $\tilde{g}$, denoted by $R(\tilde{g})$, is nonnegative everywhere, and $R(\tilde{g})$ is strictly positive somewhere in U. Observe $\mathfrak{m}(\tilde{g}) = \mathfrak{m}(g)$.

On $(M, \tilde{g})$, let w be the unique positive solution to

$$\begin{cases} L_{\tilde{g}} w & = 0 \quad \text{in } M, \\ \quad w & = 1 \quad \text{on } \Sigma, \\ \quad w & \to 1 \quad \text{at infinity,} \end{cases}$$

where $L_{\tilde{g}} = -8\Delta_{\tilde{g}} + R(\tilde{g})$ is the conformal Laplacian. The conformally deformed metric $\hat{g} = w^4 \tilde{g}$ has zero scalar curvature. The total masses $\mathfrak{m}(\hat{g})$ and $\mathfrak{m}(\tilde{g})$ are related by $\mathfrak{m}(\hat{g}) = \mathfrak{m}(\tilde{g}) + 2A$, where A is the constant in the asymptotic expansion $w = 1 + \frac{A}{|x|} + O(|x|^{-2})$, $|x| \to \infty$, on M. Since $R(\tilde{g}) \geq 0$ and $R(\tilde{g})$ is not identically zero, we have $A < 0$ by the strong maximum principle. Hence,

$$\mathfrak{m}(\hat{g}) < \mathfrak{m}(\tilde{g}) = \mathfrak{m}(g) = 0. \tag{4.2}$$

On the other hand, the mean curvature $\hat{H}$, $\tilde{H}$ of Σ in $(M, \hat{g})$, $(M, \tilde{g})$ are related by $\hat{H} = \tilde{H} + 4\frac{\partial w}{\partial \nu}$, where ν is the $\tilde{g}$-unit normal to Σ pointing into M and $\frac{\partial w}{\partial \nu} < 0$ by the strong maximum principle. Therefore,

$$\hat{H} < \tilde{H}. \tag{4.3}$$

Now take a sequence $\{\lambda_k\}$ such that $\lambda_k < \lambda_0$, $\lim_{k\to\infty} \lambda_k = \lambda_0$ and note $(\Sigma, \gamma, \lambda_k H)$ admits a nonnegative scalar curvature fill-in (Ω_k, g_k) for each k. Because $\tilde{g}$ and g agree outside $\overline{U}$, we have $\tilde{H} = \lambda_0 H$. By (4.3), we have

$$\lambda_k H > \hat{H} \tag{4.4}$$

if k is sufficiently large. For such a k, we attach (Ω, g_k) to $(M, \hat{g})$ along Σ. Applying results in [11, 14] (also see Remark 1), we have

$$\mathfrak{m}(\hat{g}) \geq 0, \tag{4.5}$$

which contradicts (4.2). This completes the first part of the proof.

To handle the remaining case, suppose that $\mathfrak{m}(g) < 0$. For a number $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, let u_ϵ be the unique, positive solution to:

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_g u_\epsilon & = 0 \quad \text{in } M, \\ \quad u_\epsilon & = 1 \quad \text{on } \Sigma, \\ \quad u_\epsilon & \to 1 - \epsilon \quad \text{at infinity.} \end{cases}$$

The conformal metric $g_\epsilon = u_\epsilon^4 g$ has nonnegative scalar curvature. The total masses $\mathfrak{m}(g_\epsilon)$ and $\mathfrak{m}(g)$ satisfy $\mathfrak{m}(g_\epsilon) = \mathfrak{m}(g) + 2(1-\epsilon)A_\epsilon$, where A_ϵ is in the expansion $u_\epsilon = (1-\epsilon) + \frac{A_\epsilon}{|x|} + O(|x|^{-2})$, $|x| \to \infty$. Since $\Delta_g u = 0$, $A_\epsilon = -\frac{1}{4\pi}\int_\Sigma \frac{\partial u_\epsilon}{\partial \nu}$ where ν is the g-unit normal to Σ pointing into M. Hence, $A_\epsilon > 0$ by the strong maximum principle, and $\lim_{\epsilon\to 1} A_\epsilon = 0$. Therefore,

$$\mathfrak{m}(g_\epsilon) < 0 \tag{4.6}$$

for all ϵ sufficiently small. Fixing such a value of ϵ, (M, g_ϵ) is a negative-mass extension of $(\Sigma, \gamma, \hat{H})$, where $\hat{H} = H + 4\frac{\partial u_\epsilon}{\partial \nu} < H$. Repeating a similar argument as in the first part of the proof yields a contradiction. □

Remark 3. The proof of Theorem 9 establishes the following: Suppose $\{(\Sigma, \gamma, H_k)\}$ is a sequence of Bartnik data such that (Σ, γ, H_k) admits a nonnegative scalar curvature fill-in for each k and $\{H_k\}$ converges to a smooth, positive function $\tilde{H}$ in the C^0-norm. Then given any positive function H satisfying $H \le \tilde{H}$, the total mass of an asymptotically flat, nonnegative scalar curvature extension of (Σ, γ, H) is nonnegative, and is zero only if the extension is static vacuum.

Corollary 2. *Given Bartnik data (Σ, γ, H), suppose $\lambda_0 = \mu_0$. Then the asymptotically flat metric $g = u^2 dr^2 + g_r$, where u is the unique positive solution to* (2.1) *with initial condition $H_0/(\mu_0 H)$, is static vacuum on $\Sigma_0 \times (0, \infty)$.*

Proof. This follows directly from the fact $\mathfrak{m}(g) = 0$ and Theorem 9. □

References

[1] Arnowitt, R., Deser, S., Misner, C. W., *Coordinate invariance and energy expressions in general relativity*, Phys. Rev. **122**, no. 2, (1961), 9971006.

[2] Bartnik, R., *New definition of quasilocal mass*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **62**, no. 20, (1989), 2346–2348.

[3] Bartnik, R., *Energy in general relativity*, Tsing Hua lectures on geometry & analysis (Hsinchu, 1990), Int. Press, Cambridge, MA, (1997), 5–27.

[4] Bartnik, R., *Quasi-spherical metrics and prescribed scalar curvature*, J. Differential Geom. **37**, (1993), 3171.

[5] Bray, H., *Proof of the Riemannian Penrose inequality using the positive mass theorem*, J. Differential Geom. **59** (2001), 177–267.

[6] Brown, J. D. and York, Jr., J. W., *Quasilocal energy in general relativity.* In *Mathematical aspects of classical field theory (Seattle, WA, 1991)*, volume 132 of *Contemp. Math.*, 129–142. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1992.

[7] Brown, J. D. and York, Jr., J. W., *Quasilocal energy and conserved charges derived from the gravitational action,* Phys. Rev. D (3), 47(4) (1993), 1407–1419.

[8] Corvino, J., *Scalar curvature deformation and a gluing construction for the Einstein constraint equations*, Comm. Math. Phys. **214** (2000), 137–189.

[9] Huisken, G. and Ilmanen, T., *The inverse mean curvature flow and the Riemannian Penrose inequality*, J. Differential Geom. **59** (2001), 353–437.

[10] Jauregui, J. L., *Fill-ins of nonnegative scalar curvature, static metrics, and quasi-local mass*, Pacific J. Math. **261** no. 2 (2013), 417–444.

[11] Miao, P., *Positive mass theorem on manifolds admitting corners along a hypersurface*, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **6** no. 6 (2002), 1163–1182.

[12] Miao, P., *On a localized Riemannian Penrose inequality*, Comm. Math. Phys. **292**, no.1, (2009), 271–284.

[13] Schoen, R. and Yau, S.-T., *On the proof of the positive mass conjecture in general relativity*, Comm. Math. Phys. **65** (1979), 45–76.

[14] Shi, Y.-G. and Tam, L.-F., *Positive mass theorem and the boundary behaviors of compact manifolds with nonnegative scalar curvature*, J. Differential Geom. **62** (2002), 79–125.

[15] Witten, E., *A new proof of the positive energy theorem*, Comm. Math. Phys. **80** (1981), 381–402.

(Jeffrey L. Jauregui) Department of Mathematics, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA.
E-mail address: `jauregui@math.upenn.edu`

(Pengzi Miao) Department of Mathematics, University of Miami, Coral Gables, FL 33146, USA.
E-mail address: `pengzim@math.miami.edu`

(Luen-Fai Tam) The Institute of Mathematical Sciences and Department of Mathematics, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shatin, Hong Kong, China.
E-mail address: `lftam@math.cuhk.edu.hk`